

silence is not correct. There are potential constitutional flaws that are inherent in the legislation. As I understand it, part of the legislation is to authorize directly funding religious institutions to provide social services.

Mr. SANTORUM. Reclaiming my time, I will read to you the provisions of this legislation on what the money is expended for. No. 1, it talks about \$2.6 billion of this legislation is a nonitemized or charitable deduction. It is not for religious organizations. It allows people who fill out the short form to deduct charitable contributions.

No. 2, IRA charitable rollovers. What it says is people who have an IRA can roll over that IRA into a charitable organization, qualified under 501(c)(3) or other, whatever organizations would be eligible, and that is \$2.9 billion over the next 10 years—again, nothing to do with faith-based organizations; no direct government dollars to anybody.

Third has to do with enhancing charitable deductions for farmers, restaurateurs, and businesses for food donations. Again, it has nothing to do with charitable choice, nothing to do with any kind of government funds going to charitable organizations.

Fourth, we have enhanced charitable deductions for book donations—again, nothing to do with charitable choice. Incentives for S corporations to give more money to charities—again, nothing to do with faith-based organizations. We have an IDA amendment, which is something the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, have championed, and I have worked on our side to allow low-income individuals to have matched savings accounts for purposes of buying a home, going to school, or starting a small business—again, nothing to do with charitable, faith-based organizations.

Also, we have the social services block grant fund which I know is wildly popular on the Democratic side of the aisle. That is \$1.37 billion over the next 2 years.

So if you look at all of these provisions, I understand the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Illinois have serious concerns about the existing charitable choice provisions in law. I accept that. I understand that. I understand the Senators from Rhode Island and from Illinois have problems with the bill the House passed because it did have an expansion of that in the House-passed bill. But the Senator from Connecticut has been very tough at negotiating with the White House and with the Senator from Pennsylvania in leaving every controversial element that could touch on any kind of constitutional infirmity out of this legislation.

You can argue that we don't fix the problem that may be in existing law, but there is nothing in this legislation that even comes close to any of those provisions. You have as much argument, in my opinion, to offer the amendments that you have offered to

homeland security as you do to this bill because neither of them deal with the subject of your amendments.

I understand there is a problem. I understand there is a debate that needs to be had on these issues, but not on this bill because this bill doesn't do what many are suggesting it does.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SANTORUM. I am happy to yield.

Mr. REID. I worked with the two leaders in arranging time that you could offer this unanimous consent request. The two managers are very anxious to get to homeland security. We have two cloture votes facing us. People wanted to offer amendments. I would ask that the Senator from Pennsylvania, as soon as he has completed his statement, yield the floor so we automatically, as I understand it, go back to homeland security. Is that right, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is right. The Senate would resume consideration of the pending business which is the substitute on homeland security.

Mr. REID. I would say to the Senator from Pennsylvania, we anticipated this taking just a little bit of time. It has taken a large amount of time.

To all my friends who have problems with this legislation, as has been indicated, the homeland defense bill is open for debate and certainly amendment. Anyone who has anything they have not been able to complete saying now on this issue could complete their statements on H.R. 5005.

All I am saying is, I hope the Senator from Pennsylvania won't talk too much longer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has the floor.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I want to say with all respect to the Senator from Nevada, the Senator from Pennsylvania has been trying to respond, actually giving the opportunity to other Members to express their concerns about this legislation. I did not call for regular order. I did not try to limit in any way those who have concerns about the legislation from having the opportunity to speak. I was using the time I had to give them the opportunity to express their concerns and then, to the extent I could, try to respond to their concerns.

I have no intention of trying to hold up the homeland security bill. I just wanted the opportunity, if we could, to have a discussion to see if we could reach some sort of accord to actually move what many of us believe is a very important piece of legislation. It does not look as if that is going to happen.

I am disappointed because I do not believe the issues that have been raised about infirmities of other pieces of statutory law are in any way impacted by this legislation. It is a tragedy that literally tens of billions of dollars that could go to low-income individuals, incentives for people to give, the oppor-

tunity to have matched savings accounts for low-income individuals to buy a home and to start a small business or to get an education, that is going to be forfeited on issues that have nothing to do with the underlying bill.

That is unfortunate. I am hopeful that now that we have had this discussion, Members will think more about it and hopefully come to a different conclusion as to whether to object to this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— S. 3009

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I intend to offer a unanimous consent request that the Senate proceed to immediate consideration of the extension of unemployment insurance. As the dialog between the distinguished Senators from Pennsylvania and Michigan just illustrated, this is an issue that had bipartisan support—really, nonpartisan support.

There are 2.2 million workers who have exhausted or are about to exhaust their benefits without finding a job. Ignoring these people, especially as we are about to enter into the Thanksgiving-Christmas holiday season, will not make them go away. It is not going to help them automatically find a job because they have been out there diligently looking.

The fact is, we don't have enough jobs right now. All of us hope that is going to turn around. But if you look at the statistics available, there are 1.7 million workers who have been unemployed for longer than 6 months as of October. That is an increase of 70,000 over September and over 180,000 over August. One out of every five of these unemployed has been out of work for more than 6 months. That is a proportion larger than at any time in the previous 8 years.

I believe that extending these benefits now sends a message to those who lost their jobs through no fault of their own in States such as mine and that of Senator CANTWELL of Washington. The provision we are asking unanimous consent on would provide 13 more weeks of unemployment insurance for everyone who lost their job, were laid off, cannot find a job. The bill would not provide a single additional benefit, if you look at what the Republicans are proposing. So our bill is a much better one because the Republicans would permit those who are about to crash into the brick wall of December 31 no relief.

I believe it is imperative that we take action before we leave.

Mr. NICKLES. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mrs. CLINTON. Certainly.

Mr. NICKLES. I wish to ask her a question before she asks unanimous consent. Just to clarify the record, to be correct, I believe she stated her proposal is a 13-week extension. Is her proposal S. 3009?

Mrs. CLINTON. Yes, it is.

Mr. NICKLES. Just to clarify, I believe that is not a 13-week extension; it is a 26-week extension.

Also, just for your information, the House may soon try to pass legislation that would eliminate this cliff as of December 31. So I want the Senator to know that efforts are being made by some in the House to pass legislation that would address the unemployment compensation issue, and extend welfare authorization, among other things.

I wanted to make sure you are aware that the bill you are trying to pass by unanimous consent, S. 3009, is not a 13-week extension, but it is a 26-week extension and costs \$17.1 billion. A simple 13-week extension costs less than half of that. I wanted to make those few facts known before I object to the Senator's request.

Mrs. CLINTON. I appreciate the Senator's factual intervention. It is the same proposal that was used in the early 1990s to extend unemployment insurance under the first President Bush. It is what has historically been done. Now, some people benefit more because of the circumstances in which they find themselves. Indeed, when we passed the only extension of unemployment insurance back in, I think, March, there were a couple of States that had been very hard hit that were given additional benefits.

As the Senator points out, what the House is about to send over is not just an unemployment insurance extension; it changes welfare law, it provides Medicare benefits to a certain category of Medicare recipients and not to others. So I think that it would be far better for us to ensure that an unemployment insurance benefit was going to be extended.

Ms. CANTWELL. Will the Senator yield?

Mrs. CLINTON. Yes.

Ms. CANTWELL. I am joining the Senator in support of bringing this up under a unanimous consent. The issue the House is looking at is simply another 5-week extension. So, yes, maybe more for the holidays people will think they have 5 more weeks. But the issue is that expansion of this unemployment program is about helping people through a tough economic time. We don't expect that it is going to get any better January 1 or January 31.

Frankly, I think if you listen to Alan Greenspan and everybody else in the administration, they don't expect it is going to get any better in the next 5 months. So the point is that we want to have a stimulus for those local economies.

My State of Washington, with nearly 80,000 people impacted, has been putting something into the economy. But starting December 31, they won't be because they won't be able to make mortgage payments or take care of health care or do a lot of things. So this is about making a statement and expanding the program beyond another 5-week Band-Aid. If we had a commitment

that we were going to be here on January 1 when the next 5 weeks runs out, and we were going to take a look at the next 6 months—but we are not doing that. We are saying we expect no economic improvement. We are not willing to step up, as the Bush 1 administration was willing to do in the 1990s, and say, yes, an extension of unemployment is a good stimulus, a safeguard, while the economy is needed to improve. That is what we are talking about here. So the Band-Aid approach that the House is sending over is simply 5 weeks, basically taking care of the worse case scenario. We need to make a positive statement. I have talked to many business people in my State who are supportive from that perspective of not taking out this income from the local economies that are being crunched.

I wanted to add to my colleague from New York, the numbers are staggering. New York has over 300,000 people who will be impacted as of December. Other States: Illinois with almost 170,000 people; Georgia, 125,000 people; Pennsylvania, 125,000 people; Texas, 215,000 people.

So there are States throughout this country that are feeling this impact. I think the previous Bush administration was very wise to say a good stimulus and a good support for unemployed workers who have lost jobs through no fault of their own, who cannot find employment, let's keep the basic income going and give a stimulus to the economy. I don't know that the Senator from New York is opposed to negotiating any kind of proposal that would get us past just a Band-Aid. I think we are willing to look at what the proposal is, but this is about the sixth or seventh unanimous consent request and negotiation proposal this side of the aisle has put forward.

We are saying that the time has run out and that these individuals are going to get very minimal—if next to nothing—good news about their economic opportunity for the next year or year and a half.

Mr. NICKLES. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mrs. CLINTON. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. I commend the Senator for offering this unanimous consent request. Secondly, in response to the points raised by the Senator from Oklahoma, as I understand it, the bill provides for an additional 13 weeks. If you have exhausted your benefits, having drawn the basic 26 weeks, and the additional 13 weeks that we have provided for in March of this year, you could then draw another 13 weeks. So for that limited group would, in fact, get 52 weeks. I point out that that limited group is unemployed. They have not been able to get a job in a labor market that is not working.

In fact, Chairman Greenspan, yesterday, testifying before the Joint Economic Committee, when asked about extending unemployment insurance

benefits, testified that the extended unemployment insurance provides a timely boost of disposable income. He acknowledged that we are currently in a period where jobs are falling. He stated:

I have always argued that in periods like this that the economic restraints on the unemployment insurance system almost surely ought to be eased.

That is exactly what this legislation seeks to do.

Secondly, there is \$27 billion in the trust fund to pay unemployment insurance benefits, specifically designed to meet this kind of situation. Those moneys have been paid into the trust fund over a period of time. The whole system was structured to have this trust fund build up in good times, and then to utilize it in bad times.

We certainly are facing bad times now. In fact, we have 2.2 million who have lost, or will lose, their unemployment benefits by the end of the year. The long-term unemployed—those more than 26 weeks—rose 71,000 last month alone. There are now more than 1.6 million long-term unemployed—a million more than when President Bush took office.

What the Senator is seeking to do was done, I must point out, under President Bush the first. For the life of me, I don't understand why President Bush the second won't agree to and support this measure.

What are these people to do who have lost their jobs? The premise of the system is you get some short-term support, the labor market picks up, and you can go back and find a job. They cannot find these jobs. In fact, not only can they not find them, more people are losing their jobs. So the labor market is constraining, not expanding. These people need help. There is \$27 billion that has been paid into the trust fund for the very purpose of providing unextended employment insurance benefits.

Now, the Senator in this legislation has not, as I understand it, sought to do some of the other proposals that have been floating around here in terms of providing a more extended coverage of the system, upping the benefits and other proposals.

There are many who think the existing system is inadequate. She is not seeking to correct that, as I understand it. We are only seeking to do this 13-week extension. I certainly think we ought to do that before this Congress leaves.

I thank the Senator.

Mrs. CLINTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. NICKLES. Will the Senator yield?

Mrs. CLINTON. Yes, I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. I want to make a statement. Too many times it happens—the Senator yields to me to ask a question, not to make a speech—many times in the debate people have yielded the floor as if they control the floor. The Presiding Officer controls

the floor. The Senator can yield for a question but not yield for a speech. I did not hear a question the last time. I do not want to get too technical, but we ought to adhere to normal Senate rules.

Now my question: The Senator is trying to pass a bill. I stated that the bill is a 26-week extension, not a 13-week extension. I keep hearing people say it is a 13-week extension. That is not factually correct. It is a 26-week extension. If you just entered into the program, am I not correct, you can exhaust your 26 weeks of State benefits and qualify for 26 weeks of 100 percent Federal benefits? It is a 26-week extension which doubles the cost of the program. It is a \$17 billion program. Am I not correct—I want to be factually correct. If I am wrong, I am happy to be corrected. But am I not correct it is really a 26-week extension for anybody entering into the program? So people could qualify for 26 weeks of State benefits and 26 weeks of Federal benefits if the Senator's bill should pass?

Mrs. CLINTON. With all due respect to my friend from Oklahoma, that is not what the bill says. The bill provides 13 weeks for those first coming into the system, but for people who have already exhausted their 13 weeks, it does provide an additional 13 weeks, which adds up to 26 weeks.

Maybe it is not artfully enough drafted. I certainly have the greatest respect for my colleague from Oklahoma, who is one of the premier legislators in this body, but if it is not clear, then I will be more than happy to write it so it is absolutely clear.

The intention is, as I have stated, to provide an additional 13 weeks to people who have exhausted their benefits. To echo the eloquent comments of my colleagues from Washington and Maryland, there are lots of people out there. The Senator from Washington read the numbers. Let me give you one quick example.

Mr. NICKLES. I want an answer to my question.

Mrs. CLINTON. The answer is the bill does not provide for those first coming into the system 26 weeks. It does provide an additional 13 weeks so that those who have exhausted their first 13 weeks can have 26 weeks.

Mr. NICKLES. Will the Senator yield further for a question?

Mrs. CLINTON. Yes.

Mr. NICKLES. I believe the bill offers 26 additional weeks for anybody who just came into the system.

Mrs. CLINTON. We would be more than happy to clarify that. That is not the way the bill was intended. It certainly is not the way it was meant to be drafted. If there is any—

Mr. NICKLES. Will the Senator yield for an additional question?

Mrs. CLINTON. Let me finish my answer. You get to ask, I get to answer. My answer is, it is intended to be a 13-week extension. If there needs to be a cutoff point so it is absolutely clear that this is the intention, we stand ready to do that.

In contrast, the bill the House is working on is a 5-week extension for those who already are in the system, and then it is over. No more help. From my perspective, representing 300,000 unemployed New Yorkers, 120,000 of whom lost their jobs directly as a result of September 11, it is very hard to go back to New York and look at people such as Felix Batista who worked for 22 years at Windows on the World, with four children—luckily was not there that day when the terrorist attack occurred—and has not been able to find work, even though we have all been trying to help him. He is a man of limited skills, but a good, hard-working person, a father of four. He has no help. What is he supposed to do? Let me ask that question of the Senator from Oklahoma. Where is my office supposed to send literally thousands of people who have no work because the economy is not producing jobs?

Mr. NICKLES. Will the Senator yield for an additional question?

Mrs. CLINTON. Yes, I will be more than happy to yield.

Mr. NICKLES. The proposal before us still has the adjusted insured unemployment rate to where it includes the following paragraph:

Except that individuals exhausting their right to regular compensation during the most recent three calendar months for which data is available before the close of the period for which such rate is being determined shall be taken into account as if they were individuals filing claims for regular compensation for each week during the period for which the rate is being determined.

Basically that means if someone even completes the system and gets a job, they still are counted as unemployed; is that still in this legislation?

Mrs. CLINTON. What we did, in response to the Senator from Oklahoma—and maybe we were misinformed about this—we went back to our last recession under the previous President Bush. We thought that would be a good model as to what was done five times to extend unemployment insurance benefits. We took the language the first Bush administration and the bipartisan body here at that time decided was the appropriate legislative language to bring about the result that people agreed was needed.

If it was in some way misguided to rely upon the first Bush administration's extension of unemployment insurance, then we are going to say we did the best we could to look at what had been effective and worked in the past.

In direct response, the people who are still being counted in the unemployment insurance is a relatively small number because, obviously, to get them on and off does take some bureaucratic and technical adjustments. There are certainly some—I am sure I could find a few in Oklahoma and a few in New York. But the fact is the overwhelming number of people who will be eligible and will receive benefits are people who deserve it, and that is, I think, the goal we should be addressing.

Mr. NICKLES. So the answer to my question is that language is still in the bill?

Mrs. CLINTON. We have the same language that was used in the first Bush recession. Now we are in the second Bush recession. We are using the same language. It worked then.

Mr. NICKLES. Will the Senator yield again? So that language is still in there. I will tell my colleague, I will never agree to this language passing. I will also tell my colleague, if she is politicizing this, talking about the first Bush recession and the second Bush recession, the first compensation package did not have the same triggers. I did not agree with the first. I do not like the language that somebody who gets a job is still counted as unemployed for these rates. I would never agree to it. I did not know it was in the first program ten or so years ago, and it will not be in the next one if I am still standing around here.

I also ask my colleague, are not the triggers different under this proposal than the compensation packages that passed in the early nineties?

Mrs. CLINTON. It is the same kind of trigger, I am advised.

Mr. NICKLES. There are different triggers. More States would qualify for greater benefits; is that not correct?

Mrs. CLINTON. It includes States with concentrated high unemployment. That is true, there is a slightly different trigger. Again, I was not around in 1991 and 1992, so I cannot speak to what the Senator would or would not have done. The fact is, we have a problem. We have tried repeatedly—eight separate times—to work out some way to provide some additional benefits for people who deserve them. If there is a way to work out a better approach, to do something that will clearly meet the objections of the Senator from Oklahoma, I stand ready to do that.

I am just worried about all of these decent people who are running out of unemployment benefits. There is nowhere for them to go. I do not know what else to bring to the floor other than those stories. We can argue about triggers. I am sure between the two of us, we can fix a trigger if there was a willingness to act on that. What is coming over from the House, larded with other controversial provisions, is not a good-faith effort to extend unemployment benefits to people in need. It is an effort to basically try to say something was done which will not have any lasting benefit for those who are most in need.

Mr. NICKLES. Will the Senator yield?

(Ms. CANTWELL assumed the chair.)

Mrs. CLINTON. Clearly, if the Senator from Oklahoma is going to object to our following the precedent of the triggers of the President Bush 1 package, then obviously we are going to have to go back to the drawing board.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar

No. 619, S. 3009, a bill to provide for a 13-week extension of unemployment compensation; that the bill be read three times, passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, without intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, reserving the right to object, the UC request, as I read it, says it is a 13-week extension. The bill before us is a 26-week extension. A 13-week extension, I believe, costs \$7.3 billion; a 26-week extension cost—by CBO—is \$17.1 billion. That is the proposal before us, and, therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The Senator from Nevada.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. It is my understanding that we now automatically go to the homeland security legislation. Is that true?

Mrs. CLINTON. Will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. REID. Yes.

Mrs. CLINTON. Did the Senator from Oklahoma actually propound an objection or reserve the right to object?

Mr. NICKLES. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. The two managers of this bill have been very patient and cooperative, but we have to ask their patience once again. We have a matter that the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. BARKLEY, wishes to bring forward in honor of Senator Wellstone. This will take a short period of time, and I ask that we be able to move to that at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask for time before the Senators from Minnesota speak.

Mr. REID. I ask that the Senator from Washington be recognized after the two Senators from Minnesota speak. Would that be appropriate?

Mrs. MURRAY. How much time will the Senators from Minnesota require?

Mr. REID. Could I ask of my two friends how much time they wish to take on this matter?

Mr. BARKLEY. Madam President, I wish to take approximately 4 minutes.

Mr. DAYTON. Madam President, I will be approximately the same.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the two Senators from Minnesota be recognized for 10 minutes equally divided between the two of them. Following their statements—I understand they want to move legislation—I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Washington be recognized.

Senator MURRAY indicates she only wishes to speak for up to 5 minutes. So I am sure my two friends would allow

her to proceed for up to 5 minutes, and then following that the two Senators from Minnesota would be recognized for up to 10 minutes.

Following that, we will definitely go to the homeland security bill. There are people waiting to offer amendments. So I make that in the form of a unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I thank my colleague from Nevada for his indulgence, and I thank my colleagues from Minnesota for allowing me a few minutes before they pay a very important tribute to Senator Paul Wellstone.

PIPELINE SAFETY

Mrs. MURRAY. I rise today to note a very significant event that occurred last night on the floor of the Senate, and that was the passage of the pipeline safety conference report.

As the Presiding Officer knows, in our State of Washington, a tragic accident occurred 3½ years ago when a pipeline blew up on a sunny June afternoon, tragically killing three young children in our State and devastating a mile-wide section of a river that travels through Bellingham, WA. This was a traumatic event that has impacted the lives not only of those families and their friends but hundreds of people in Bellingham and across this country.

At the time, I thought this was a uniquely tragic accident that occurred in my State when a pipeline suddenly blew up on a sunny Friday afternoon, after school. But after coming back to Washington, DC, and researching what was known about pipelines, I found out that in a short time period, between 1986 and 1999, there had been 5,700 pipeline accidents.

What happened in my home State was not unique. Three hundred twenty-five people had died in that time period. There had been 1,500 injuries that had occurred and \$850 million in environmental damage. Working with many colleagues, Senator MCCAIN, who chaired the Commerce Committee, and Senator HOLLINGS, who worked diligently with me, Senators INOUE, BREAU, WYDEN, BROWNBACK, BINGAMAN, DOMENICI, CORZINE, TORRICELLI, my colleague who is presiding today, Senator CANTWELL, and former Senator Gorton, made this an issue in this country. It has been a long and difficult road. We have passed this bill out of the Senate on several occasions. We have been stopped in the House, and today we are finally at a point where the House, I believe, is going to pass this legislation as well, and it will be sent to the President of the United States. It will put into place significant new improvements on training and qualifications of our pipeline personnel, on inspection and prevention practices, on tough penalties for people who violate this, and States' abilities to expand their safety activities.

For the thousands of families who live next to pipelines, who work next to pipelines, who send their kids to schools next to pipelines, this is definitely an improvement in our law.

Is it everything we ask for? No. But today I want to rise and thank all of my colleagues, and Congressman LARSEN as well, for finally moving us to a point where the families of Wade King, Stephen Tsiourvas, and Liam Wood can realize the hard work they have put in is going to finally result in a change of law that means some future child, some future family, some future community, will not have to face the situation as they have.

I thank my colleagues for their work on this, and I look forward to having the President sign this into law.

I yield the floor.

PAUL AND SHEILA WELLSTONE CENTER FOR COMMUNITY BUILDING ACT

Mr. BARKLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 3156, introduced earlier today by myself and Senator DAYTON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3156) to provide a grant for the construction of a new community center in St. Paul, Minnesota, in honor of the late Senator Paul Wellstone and his beloved wife, Sheila.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Madam President, today, Senator DAYTON and I are introducing legislation to pay tribute to Senator Paul Wellstone and his beloved wife Sheila.

Our legislation would provide a \$10 million authorization of Federal funds for construction of the "Paul and Sheila Wellstone Center for Community Building" at Neighborhood House in St. Paul, MN, where Paul and Sheila lived.

First, let me thank the leadership on both sides of the aisle for facilitating consideration of this legislation. Senator DAYTON and his staff, Senator Wellstone's family and staff, and especially my colleague from West Virginia, Senator BYRD, have literally moved heaven and earth to bring this bill to the floor.

I may be the newest Member of this Chamber, but I fully appreciate the extraordinary efforts of so many to allow Senator DAYTON and I to create a living legacy in honor of Paul and Sheila Wellstone in such short order.

Neighborhood House was founded by the women of Mount Zion Temple in the 1880's as a settlement house, helping newly arrived Eastern European Jewish immigrants to establish a new life and thrive in their new community.

Senator Wellstone always had a genuine affinity for Neighborhood House,